Quantitative robustness of regularity for 3D Navier-Stokes system in $\dot{H}^\alpha$-spaces

Jan Burczak[1] **and W. M. Zajączkowski**[1,2]

[1] Institute of Mathematics, Polish Academy of Sciences,
Śniadeckich 8, 00-950 Warsaw, Poland,
e-mail: jb@impan.pl;

[2] Institute of Mathematics and Cryptology, Cybernetics Faculty,
Military University of Technology, Kaliskiego 2, 00-908 Warsaw,
Poland

arXiv:1409.3485v2 [math.AP] 2 Feb 2016

Abstract. We present stability and regularity results for the 3D incompressible Navier-Stokes system in a periodic box, in $\dot{H}^\alpha$ spaces, with $\alpha \in \big[1/2, 1\big]$. A special attention is paid to obtaining quantitative results, i.e. ones with explicit or at least computable constants, and to scaling.

MSC 2010: 35Q30, 76D03, 76D05

Keywords: Navier-Stokes system, stability, regularity, numerical verification of regularity, numerical falsification of regularity, homogenous Sobolev spaces, scaling

1. Introduction

We study stability of a regular solution u of a 3D Navier-Stokes system in the periodic cube $Q_L := [0, L]^3$. Namely, let us fix an L-periodic pair (u, p) solving[(1)] in $Q_L \times [0, T]$

$$\begin{cases} u_{,t} + u \cdot \nabla u - \nu \Delta u + \nabla p = f, \\ \mathrm{div} u = 0, \\ u(0) = u_0, \end{cases} \qquad (NS_{f,u_0})$$

where ν is a positive parameter (viscosity) and f is a given function (external force). We assume that u is more regular than a weak solution; more precisely, that it is additionally an α-strong solution, i.e. $u \in L^\infty(\dot{H}^\alpha) \cap L^2(\dot{H}^{1+\alpha})$ for $\alpha \in \big[1/2, 1\big]$. Next, let us consider a weak solution v to (NS_{g,v_0}) and ask what are the conditions on differences of data of u and v, i.e. on $|f - g|$ and $|u_0 - v_0|$, that allow v to inherit α-strong regularity of u.

This problem is referred to as a problem of stability of strong solutions or, in a more debonair manner, as a problem of robustness of regularity. It can be seen as an intermediary step between the easily accessible small-data-regularity of solutions to the 3D Navier-Stokes system and their unknown regularity *in the large*, which is one of the Millennium Problem of the Clay Mathematics Institute. Namely, one may hope that it is possible, firstly, to cover an entire space of initial data with a net of initial data that give rise to regular solutions and, next, to conclude the regularity for *every* initial datum by a stability result around points of this net. Some of such programs aimed at obtaining regularity by stability are so-called *schemes for numerical verification of regularity*, see Marín-Rubio, Robinson and Sadowski [M-RRS] and its references (for more on this, compare also the concluding section of this note).

In order to make a stability result useful in practice for further attempts to attack the regularity problem, it needs to contain clear dependences on parameters and constants (which especially important for numerics). This was our initial motivation to prove the main result of this note, namely Theorem 1, subsection 1.2. It refines and generalizes Theorem 1 of [M-RRS]. Our Theorem 1 provides explicit, quantitative dependencies on parameters and constants. Moreover, it takes into account scaling-related phenomena. For the next planned steps of our studies of regularity-via-stability, that shall originate in this note, please refer to its concluding section. There, we suggest also a new approach to devise a scheme aimed at *numerical falsification of regularity conjecture of solutions to the* 3*D Navier-Stokes system*.

As a byproduct (or, more precisely, as a needed ingredient to prove Theorem 1) we obtain also a global-in-time regularity result for small data and a regularity result for a small existence time (respectively, Theorems 2 and 3 in subsection 1.2). In the former,

(1) For rigorous definition of the solution and for presentation of underlying function space, please refer to Section 2.

in addition to the standard blowup characterization of the maximal time of existence, we provide also a caloric characterization. These regularity results are also quantitative, in the sense of explicitly computed constants and smallness parameters.

1.1. Current state of research in stability of strong solutions to the Navier-Stokes system

A numerous variants of the stability problem have been a subject of intensive research. The following, extremely brief presentation merely recalls the most common approaches. In particular, we do not dwell into a diversity of the considered domains or boundary conditions.

One often proves stability separately for each special regular solution separately. Namely, one fixes a concrete 'special' regular solution (for instance a two-dimensional one, an axially symmetric without swirl one, helicoidal one etc.) and shows that any perturbed solution (i.e. one with data close to the fixed, regular one) stays regular. A more general approach consists in taking any solution from a given class of regular solutions and showing that its perturbations remain regular. Compare for instance Iftimie [I], Mucha [M1] (for two dimensional special solutions), Zajączkowski [Za] (where the stability problem around a given linear combination of two-dimensional and axially symmetric solutions is considered), Bardos et als. [BLNNT] (for all three mentioned types), Zajączkowski and Zadrzyńska [ZaZa] as well as their references.

Finally, one can simply consider an arbitrary regular solution (without indicating its construction or class of special solutions that it belongs to) and show that its perturbations are regular. In this context compare for instance: DaVeiga and Secchi [dVS] for L^p spaces approach; Auscher, Dubois and Tchamitchian [ADT] for BMO^{-1} spaces, see also Koch and Tataru [KT] for the latter.

Let us finally recall Mucha [M2], the monograph by Chemin et als. [CDGG] and the classical one by Constantin and Foias [CF], because our considerations are close to them: to [M2] in context of providing a stability result in a periodic setting, to [CDGG] in context of similar approach to regularity and used function spaces, and to [CF] in context of a functional setting and a special attention to scaling.

1.2. The results

Recall that $\nu > 0$ is a viscosity parameter, $Q_L := [0, L]^3$ is our periodic domain and that α-strong solution to a Navier-Stokes system is such weak solution, that additionally belongs to $L^\infty(\dot{H}^\alpha) \cap L^2(\dot{H}^{1+\alpha})$. We denote the Fourier-series-based norm in $\dot{H}^\alpha(Q_L)$ with $|\cdot|_{\alpha,L}$. All the needed (standard) definitions has been shifted to Section 2. Let us

fix

$$K_2 := \sqrt{2}C_S(1-\alpha)C_S(1)C_S\left(\alpha-\frac{1}{2}\right)\left(\frac{2\pi}{L}\right)^{-1},$$

$$K_3 := \varepsilon_1^{-3}\frac{27}{128}(2\pi)^{-12}C_S^4(1-\alpha)C_S^4(1)\left(\frac{2\pi}{L}\right)^{2(1-2\alpha)}\left[1+C_S\left(\alpha-\frac{1}{2}\right)(2\pi)^{\alpha-2}\right]^4,$$

$$K_4 := \frac{1}{4\varepsilon_2}\left(\frac{2\pi}{L}\right)^{-2},$$

where $C_S(\beta)$ denotes a constant of the 2π-normalized, 3D Sobolev-Poincaré inequality, i.e.

$$|f|_{L^{\beta^*}(Q_{2\pi})} \le C_S(\beta)|f|_{\beta,2\pi},$$

where $\beta \in [0,2)$, $\beta^* := \frac{6}{3-2\beta}$. Since null-mean-value functions are involved, the lower order terms for the r.h.s. of the inequality above are superfluous.

Observe that for K_3 becomes invariant upon L-scaling for $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$.

1.2.1 The stability result

Theorem 1. *(Robustness of regularity). Let us choose $T_* > 0$, $\alpha \in [1/2;1]$ and data*

$$u_0, v_0 \in \dot{H}^{\alpha}_{\mathrm{div}}(Q_L), \quad f, g \in L^2(0,T_*;\dot{H}^{\alpha-1}_{\mathrm{div}}(Q_L)).$$

Assume that u is an α-strong solution to (NS_{f,u_0}) with its time of existence T_*. Given any positive $\bar{\nu}, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2$ such that

$$\bar{\nu} + \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 < \nu,$$

every Leray-Hopf weak solution v that starts close to u and that has a similar forcing is also an α-strong solution.
More precisely, let us fix any $T < T_*$. Under the proximity assumption for the data

$$\left(|u_0-v_0|^2_{\alpha,L} + K_4\int_0^T |f-g|^2_{\alpha-1,L}(t)\,dt\right)\mathrm{e}^{K_3\int_0^T |\nabla u(t)|^4_{L^{\frac{3}{2-\alpha}}(Q_L)}\,dt} < \left(\frac{\bar{\nu}}{K_2}\right)^2 \quad (A1)$$

v is an α-strong solution to (NS_{g,v_0}) with its time of existence $T_*(g,v_0) > T$. Moreover, v is close to u according to the following formula

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} |u-v|^2_{\alpha,L}(t) + (\nu - (\bar{\nu}+\varepsilon_1+\varepsilon_2))\int_0^T |u-v|^2_{\alpha+1,L}(t)\,dt \le \left(\frac{\bar{\nu}}{K_2}\right)^2. \quad (P1)$$

The proof of Theorem 1 is provided in Section 3.

Observe that $\int_0^T |\nabla u(t)|^4_{L^{\frac{3}{2-\alpha}}}\,dt < \infty$, needed in the proximity assumption $(A1)$, is given automatically by the fact that u is the α-strong solution, since by interpolation

$$L^\infty(\dot{H}^\alpha) \cap L^2(\dot{H}^{1+\alpha}) \hookrightarrow L^4(W^{1,\frac{3}{2-\alpha}}).$$

To clarify this point quantitatively, let us state

Corollary 1. *For validity of the proximity assumption (A1) it suffices*

$$\left(|u_0 - v_0|^2_{\alpha,L} + K_4 \int_0^T |f-g|^2_{\alpha-1,L}(t)\,dt\right)\times \\ \mathrm{e}^{K_3 C_I^4(\alpha,T)\left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{2(\alpha-1)}|u|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;|\cdot|_{\alpha,L})}|u|^2_{L^2(0,T;|\cdot|_{1+\alpha,L})}} < \left(\frac{\bar{\nu}}{K_2}\right)^2, \tag{A2}$$

where $C_I(\alpha,T)$ comes from Definition 2 in subsection 2.5.

The proof of Corollary 1 is given in Section 3.

Let us remark that having a qualitative $\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ stability result (see for instance Theorem 3.5 in [CDGG]), one can immediately state a stability result in $\dot{H}^\alpha$, $\alpha > 1/2$ via a Ladyzhenskaya-Prodi-Serrin-type condition, but it would be a merely qualitative one (without any control of involved constants and parameters), hence useless for practical applications.

1.2.2 The regularity results

Local-in-time regularity and uniqueness

In order to show Theorem 1, we need the following theorem on local-in-time existence of strong solutions and on their uniqueness

Theorem 2. *(local-in-time α-strong solutions). Given $T > 0$, $\alpha \in [1/2, 1]$ and data*

$$u_0 \in \dot{H}^\alpha_{\mathrm{div}}(Q_L),\ f \in L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^{\alpha-1}_{\mathrm{div}}(Q_L)),$$

there is $T_*(u_0,f) \in (0,T]$ such that there exists a

$$C([0,T_*(u_0,f));\dot{H}^\alpha_{\mathrm{div}}(Q_L)) \cap L^2(0,T_*(u_0,f);\dot{H}^{1+\alpha}_{\mathrm{div}}(Q_L))$$

solution to (NS_{f,u_0}). Moreover, such solution is unique among Leray-Hopf weak solutions to (NS_{f,u_0}).
Finite $T_*(u_0,f)$ can be characterized by the blowup, i.e.

$$\max_{t\le\tau}|u(t)|_{\alpha,L} \overset{\tau\to T_*(u_0,f)}{\longrightarrow} \infty.$$

Observe that in Theorem 2 one obtains continuity in time of the $\dot{H}^\alpha_{\mathrm{div}}$ norm and not only its boundedness in time, that is in the definition of an α-strong solution. The proof of Theorem 2 is standard. For clarity we present it in Subsection 4.2. There, we obtain

also the following *caloric lower bound* for the time $T_*(u_0, f)$. In order to formulate it, for $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$ let us denote by

$$P_{k_0} : \dot{H}^0_{\mathrm{div}}(Q) \to \mathrm{span}\{e^{2\pi i k \cdot \frac{x}{L}} : k \leq k_0\}$$

the projection on the low-frequency space (with the inequality understood componentwise)
In the following lemma, by u^{Lo} we understand the solution to the homogeneous heat system that emanates from $P_{k_0}u_0$, i.e. to

$$\begin{cases} u^{Lo}_{,t} - \nu\Delta u^{Lo} = 0, \\ u^{Lo}(0) = u^{Lo}_0. \end{cases}$$

Recall that K_2 and K_3 come from Theorem 1.

Lemma 1. *(Caloric lower bound for T_*). Let us fix any positive $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2$ and $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$ so large that*

$$\mu := \nu - \left(\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 + K_2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|u_0 - P_{k_0}u_0|_{\alpha,L}\right)\right) > 0.$$

as well as an arbitrary $\delta > 0$ and $\sigma \in (0,1)$. Any time T_0 that yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\frac{K_2}{\nu - \varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2 - \sigma\mu}\right)^2 \frac{1}{2\delta}\left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{2\alpha+1} \int_0^{T_0} |u^{Lo}(\tau) \otimes u^{Lo}(\tau)|^2_{1+\alpha,L}\, d\tau \\ &\leq e^{-K_3\left(\int_0^{T_0} |\nabla u^{Lo}(\tau)|^4_{L^{\frac{3}{2-\alpha}}(Q_L)} d\tau + \delta T_0\right)} - \left(\frac{(1-\sigma)\mu}{\nu - \varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2 - \sigma\mu} - 1\right)^2 \end{aligned} \tag{A3}$$

is a lower bound for $T_*(f, u_0)$, i.e. $T_*(f, u_0) \geq T_0$. Moreover

$$\sup_{t \leq T_0} \frac{1}{2}|u(t)|^2_{\alpha,L} + \sigma\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\int_0^{T_0} |u(t)|^2_{\alpha+1,L}\, dt \leq \left(\frac{\nu - \varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2 - \sigma\mu}{K_2}\right)^2.$$

The notion 'caloric' indicates that our lower bound is related to the homogeneous heat system, governing u^{Lo}. Observe that in Lemma 1 the largest T_0 is related to equality on (A3). We decided to keep inequality in formulation of Lemma 1, since it is easier computable than an equality.

Global-in-time regular, small solutions

Finally, we obtain also the following global-in-time α-strong solutions for small data.

Theorem 3. *Let us fix any $T \in (0, \infty]$ and any positive $\bar{\nu}, \varepsilon_2$ such that*

$$\bar{\nu} + \varepsilon_2 < \nu.$$

Assume that data f, u_0 satisfy the following smallness condition

$$\left(|u_0|^2_{\alpha,L} + K_4 \int_0^T |f(t)|^2_{\alpha-1,L}\, dt \right) < \left(\frac{\bar{\nu}}{K_2} \right)^2. \tag{A4}$$

Then (NS_{f,u_0}) has the α-regular solution on $[0,T]$ with the estimate

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} |u(t)|^2_{\alpha,L} + (\nu - \bar{\nu} - \varepsilon_2) \int_0^T |u|^2_{\alpha+1,L} \leq \left(\frac{\bar{\nu}}{K_2} \right)^2.$$

For the proof, see Subsection 4.3.

Since considering certain classes of 'highly–oscilliating' initial data, giving rise to regular solutions, has gained recently serious attention, let us state

Corollary 2. *Assume that $f = 0$ and $\alpha \in [1/2, 1]$. Given any positive: $\bar{\nu}$ such that $\bar{\nu} < \nu$ and L_0 such that $\frac{L}{L_0} \in \mathbb{N}$, if the initial datum u_0 is L_0-periodic and*

$$L_0\, |(u_0)_{|L_0}|_{\alpha,L_0} < \frac{2\pi\bar{\nu}}{\sqrt{2} C_S(1-\alpha) C_S(1) C_S\big(\alpha - \frac{1}{2}\big)},$$

then (NS_{0,u_0}) has the α-regular solution on $[0,\infty)$ with the estimate

$$L \sup_{t\in[0,\infty)} |u(t)|_{\alpha,L} \leq \frac{2\pi\bar{\nu}}{\sqrt{2} C_S(1-\alpha) C_S(1) C_S\big(\alpha - \frac{1}{2}\big)}.$$

The proof of Corollary 2 boils down to constructing our L-periodic solution u as a juxtaposition of $\frac{L}{L_0}$ L_0-periodic solutions staring from $(u_0)_{|L_0}$ and its shifts.

2. Preliminaries

Here we present the detailed setting for our problem. It is standard and based on [CF], Chapter 4 and [Tem].

2.1. Function spaces

Homogeneous Sobolev spaces $\dot{H}^s$. Let us introduce the Fourier basis

$$\omega^j_{L,k} = e^{\frac{2\pi i}{L}k\cdot x}b_j, \quad \omega_{L,k} = (\omega^1_{L,k}, \cdots, \omega^N_{L,k}),$$

with $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $x \in Q_L = [0, L]^d$ and b_j is the j-th canonical vector of $\mathbb{R}^N$. The space

$$\dot{H}^s(Q_L) := \left\{ u = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d\setminus\{0\}} u_k \cdot \omega_{L,k} \mid u_k \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{N}}, u_k = \bar{u}_{-k}, u_0 = 0, \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d\setminus\{0\}} |k|^{2s}|u_k|^2 < +\infty \right\},$$

where $s \in \mathbb{R}$, becomes the Hilbert space, equipped with the product

$$\langle u, w\rangle_{s,L} := \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d\setminus\{0\}} |k|^{2s} u_k \bar{w}_k$$

that generates the norm $|\cdot|_{s,L}$. We will also use the generalized scalar product (duality formula)

$$\langle u, w\rangle_{\alpha,\beta;L} := \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d\setminus\{0\}} (|k|^\alpha u_k)(|k|^\beta \bar{w}_k)$$

for $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$. For $\alpha + \beta = 2s$ one has $\langle u, w\rangle_{\alpha,\beta,L} = \langle u, w\rangle_{s,L}$.

We call $\dot{H}^s(Q_L)$ a real ($u^l_k = \bar{u}^l_{-k}$), zero average (u^l_0 plays no role, because we sum over $\mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$), fractional ($s \in \mathbb{R}$), homogenous Sobolev space of periodic functions ($u^l(x + Le_j) = u^l(x)$ thanks to the Fourier-series-based definition). The homogeneity of $\dot{H}^s(Q_L)$ follows from absence of lower-order terms in its norm.

Observe that one has the following scaling-invariance. Let us define for $u : Q_L \to \mathbb{R}^N$ its dilation $u_\delta : Q_{\delta L} \to \mathbb{R}^N$ by $u_\delta(x) = u(\delta x)$. The Fourier coefficients of u and u_δ are identical, because $\omega_{L,k}(x) = \omega_{\delta L,k}(\delta x)$.

One of advantages of working with homogeneous Sobolev spaces is that for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$

$$(\dot{H}^s(Q_L))^* \simeq \dot{H}^{-s}(Q_L),$$

see [Tem].

From now on, we work with domain and target dimensions equal 3, i.e. $d = N = 3$.

We will use also the zero-divergence subspace of $\dot{H}^s(Q)$, i.e.

$$\dot{H}^s_{\mathrm{div}}(Q) := \{u \in \dot{H}^s(Q) |\ k \cdot u_k = 0, \ \ k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}\}$$

closed under the norm $|\cdot|_s$.

Lebesgue spaces L^p and Sobolev spaces $W^{1,p}$. Additionally, we will use $L^p(\Omega)$ spaces with the integro-differential norm $|f|_{L^p(\Omega)} := \left(\int_\Omega |f|^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$ as well as $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ spaces with the integro-differential norm $|f|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} := \left(\int_\Omega (|f|^p + |\nabla f|^p)\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$. In the last formula $\nabla f : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{3\times 3}$ denotes the weak derivative of f.

At few occasions we will need the following identity

$$|\nabla u|_{L^2(Q_L)} = L^{\frac{d}{2}} \left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} |u|_{1,L}, \tag{1.1}$$

valid by a computation.

Bochner spaces. For a bounded (time) interval I and a Banach space V, space $L^p(I;V)$ consists of all strongly measurable functions $u : I \to V$ with finite

$$|u|^p_{L^p(I;V)} := \int_I |u(t)|^p_V dt, \qquad p \in [1,\infty); \qquad\qquad |u|_{L^\infty(I;V)} := \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t\in I} |u(t)|_V.$$

By a strongly measurable function we understand $u\colon I \to V$ that can be almost everywhere approximated by step functions $u_n : I \to V$ with respect to the norm of the space V, i.e. for a.e. $t \in I$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} |u_n(t) - u(t)|_V \;=\; 0$$

Analogously, for a compact interval I, space $C(I;V)$ consists of all continuous functions $u\colon \overline{I} \to V$ with finite

$$|u|_{C(I;V)} := \max_{t\in I} |u(t)|.$$

For $I = \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} I_n$, I_n's being compact intervals, space $C(I;V)$ consists of all continuous functions $u\colon I \to V$ with finite

$$|u|_{C(I_n;V)}$$

for any n.

For some more details on Bochner spaces, one may refer to Zeidler [Z], Chapter 23 and Chapter 2 of Pokorný [Pok].

2.2. Stokes operator

The (stationary) Stokes problem in a periodic cube Q_L, i.e. the problem of finding for a certain $f \in H^{-1}(Q_L)$ a pair $(u,p) \in \dot{H}^1_{\mathrm{div}}(Q_L) \times L^2(Q_L)$ that satisfies

$$-\Delta u + \nabla p = f, \quad \mathrm{div} u = 0$$

in Q_L admits in our periodic setting the following explicit solution

$$u = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d\setminus\{0\}} u_k \cdot \omega_{L,k}, \qquad p = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d\setminus\{0\}} p_k\, e^{\frac{2\pi i}{L} k\cdot x},$$

where

$$u^j_k = -\frac{L^2}{4\pi^2|k|^2}\left(f_k - \frac{(k\cdot f_k)k}{|k|^2} \right), \text{ for } j = 1,2,3, \qquad p_k = \frac{Lk\cdot f_k}{2i\pi|k|^2}.$$

Under assumption of divergent-free forcing the pressure vanishes and the 'solution mapping' $f \mapsto u$ from $\dot{H}^0_{\mathrm{div}}(Q_L)$ to $\dot{H}^2_{\mathrm{div}}(Q_L)$ is bijective. Hence its inverse is meaningful. We denote it by $A : \dot{H}^2_{\mathrm{div}}(Q_L) \mapsto \dot{H}^0_{\mathrm{div}}(Q_L)$ and refer to as the Stokes operator. In our case it degenerates to $-\Delta$. On the side of Fourier coefficients, A is the multiplication with $-\frac{4\pi^2|k|^2}{L^2}$, i.e.

$$(Au)_k = -u_k \frac{4\pi^2|k|^2}{L^2}$$

Hence we have

$$Au = -\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d\setminus\{0\}} \lambda_k u_k \cdot \omega_{L,k}$$

with $\lambda_k := \frac{4\pi^2|k|^2}{L^2}$. Consequently, via the definition of norm $|\cdot|_{s,L}$,

$$|Au|_{0,L} = \frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}|u|_{2,L}. \tag{2.1}$$

Formula (2.1) admits a generalisation that defines powers of the operator A. Namely, $A^\alpha : \dot{H}^{2\alpha}_{\mathrm{div}}(Q_L) \mapsto \dot{H}^0_{\mathrm{div}}(Q_L)$ is given as

$$A^\alpha u := \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d\setminus\{0\}} \lambda_k^\alpha u_k \cdot \omega_{L,k}.$$

The formula (2.1) is thus generalised to

$$|A^\alpha u|_{0,L} = \left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^\alpha |u|_{2\alpha,L} \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{2.2}$$

and further to

$$|A^\alpha u|_{\beta,L} = \left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{\alpha-\gamma} |A^\gamma u|_{\delta,L} \tag{2.3}$$

for

$$2\alpha + \beta = 2\gamma + \delta, \quad \alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta \in \mathbb{R}.$$

In view of the definition of the operator A, we see that $A^{\alpha+\beta} = A^\alpha \circ A^\beta$.

2.4. Weak solution to Navier-Stokes system

In this subsection we drop a precise control over constants, because it is superfluous here.
Let us denote by $B(a,b) = a \cdot \nabla b$ and choose

$$f \in L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^{-1}_{\mathrm{div}}(Q_L)),\ u_0 \in \dot{H}^0_{\mathrm{div}}(Q_L).$$

The first energy inequality motivates that u solving (NS_{f,u_0}) belongs to

$$L^\infty(0,T;\dot{H}^0_{\rm div}(Q_L))\cap L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^1_{\rm div}(Q_L)).$$

In particular $u(t)\in\dot{H}^1_{\rm div}(Q_L)$ for a.a. $t\in[0,T]$. Consequently one has

$$Au=-\Delta u\in L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^{-1}_{\rm div}(Q_L)),\quad\text{and}\quad B(u,u)\in L^{\frac{4}{3}}(0,T;\dot{H}^{-1}_{\rm div}(Q_L)),\tag{2.4}$$

whereas the latter follows, via duality, from the estimate

$$|\int_0^T\langle u(t)\cdot\nabla u(t),\varphi(t)\rangle_{0,L}\,dt|\le C|u|_{L^4(0,T;L_3(Q_L))}|u|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^1(Q_L))}|\varphi|_{L^4(0,T;L_6(Q_L))}\tag{2.5}$$

for a sufficiently regular, divergence-free φ. The term $|u|_{L^4(0,T;L_3(Q_L))}$ in (2.5) is finite thanks to parabolic embedding following from the regularity of the first energy inequality. Hence for $f\in L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^{-1}_{\rm div}(Q_L))$, after testing formally (NS_{f,u_0}) with divergence–free, sufficiently smooth, Q_L-periodic φ, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^T\langle u_{,t}(t),\varphi(t)\rangle_{-1,1;L}dt=\int_0^T\langle f(t)-B(u(t),u(t))-\nu A(u(t)),\varphi(t)\rangle_{-1,1;L}dt\\&\le C_{u,f}|\varphi|_{L^4(0,T;\dot{H}^1_{\rm div}(Q_L))},\end{aligned}\tag{2.6}$$

where $C_{u,f}$ denotes a finite quantity related to both (2.4) and $L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^{-1}_{\rm div}(Q_L))$ norm of f. Consequently (2.6) indicates, via duality, that $u_{,t}\in L^{\frac{4}{3}}(0,T;\dot{H}^{-1}_{\rm div}(Q_L))$. This motivates the following definition

Definition 1. *(weak solution) Let*

$$f\in L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^{-1}_{\rm div}(Q_L)),\quad u_0\in\dot{H}^0_{\rm div}(Q_L).$$

We call

$$u\in L^\infty(0,T;\dot{H}^0_{\rm div}(Q_L))\cap L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^1_{\rm div}(Q_L))$$

with the distributional time derivative $u_{,t}\in L^{\frac{4}{3}}(0,T;\dot{H}^{-1}_{\rm div}(Q_L))$ the (variational) weak solution to (NS_{f,u_0}) iff the formula (2.6) holds for every test function $\varphi\in\dot{H}^1_{\rm div}(Q_L)$ at almost every $t\in[0,T]$. The initial condition is attained in the $C_\omega([0,T];\dot{H}^0_{\rm div}(Q_L))$ sense, namely

$$\langle u(t),\xi\rangle_{0,L}\overset{t\to0}{\longrightarrow}\langle u_0,\xi\rangle_{0,L}\quad\text{for any}\quad\xi\in\dot{H}^0_{\rm div}(Q_L).$$

Let us motivate the way in which the initial condition is satisfied. Since

$$u_{,t}\in L^{\frac{4}{3}}(0,T;\dot{H}^{-1}_{\rm div}(Q_L))\subset L^1(0,T;\dot{H}^{-1}_{\rm div}(Q_L)),$$

u has a representative in $C([0,T],\dot{H}^{-1}_{\rm div}(Q_L))$. This information together with $u\in L^\infty(0,T;\dot{H}^0_{\rm div}(Q_L))$ implies, in turn, $u\in C_\omega([0,T];\dot{H}^0_{\rm div}(Q_L))$. For details, see for instance Lemmas 2.2.3 and 2.2.5 of [Pok].

It holds

Lemma 2. *For any $T > 0$ there is a weak solution to (NS_{f,u_0}) that satisfies*

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}|u(t)|^2_{0,L} + \nu|u(t)|^2_{1,L} \le \langle f(t), u(t)\rangle_{-1,1;L}. \tag{2.7}$$

The proof can be found for instance in Chapter 3 of [Tem]. Inequality (2.7) is referred to as the *(weak) energy inequality* and a weak solution that obeys (2.7) is called a *Leray-Hopf weak solution*. It is not known if it is unique. If it belongs additionally to $L^r(L^s)$ with $\frac{3}{s} + \frac{2}{r} \le 1$, $s \in [3, \infty]$ (the Ladyzhenskaya-Prodi-Serrin class), it becomes unique and regular, see Serrin [Ser], Galdi [Gal], Escauriaza, Seregin, Šverák [ESŠ].

2.5. Imbeddings and interpolations

Firstly, let us show a result needed in Section 4 to estimate the nonlinear term. Let us define

$$K_{(2.8)}(\alpha, L) = \frac{2\pi}{L}(2\pi)^{-3}C_S(1-\alpha)C_S(1),$$

$$K_{(2.9)}(\alpha, L) = \left(\frac{2\pi}{L}\right)^{\alpha-2} C_S\left(\alpha - \frac{1}{2}\right),$$

where $C_S(\beta)$ denotes a numerical constant of the optimal 2π-normalized 3D Sobolev-Poincaré inequality, see subsection 1.2.

Proposition 1. Assume that $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. Then

$$|\langle B(a,b), A^\alpha w\rangle_{0,L}| \le K_{(2.8)}(\alpha, L)|a|_{1,L}|\nabla b|_{L^{\frac{3}{2-\alpha}}(Q_L)}|A^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}}w|_{0,L}, \tag{2.8}$$

$$|v|_{L^{\frac{3}{2-\alpha}}(Q_L)} \le K_{(2.9)}(\alpha, L)|v|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\alpha-1,L}|v|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\alpha,L}, \tag{2.9}$$

provided the r.h.s.'s are meaningful.

Proof. First we perform the estimates for $L = 2\pi$ (where we drop the dependence on $Q_{2\pi}$) and next we rescale.
Step 1. (case $L = 2\pi$) The Hölder inequality gives for $\alpha \in [0, 2]$

$$|\langle B(a,b), A^\alpha w\rangle_{0,2\pi}| = \left|(2\pi)^{-d}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} B(a,b)A^\alpha w\right| \le (2\pi)^{-d}|a|_{L^6}|\nabla b|_{L^{\frac{3}{2-\alpha}}}|A^\alpha w|_{L^{\frac{6}{1+2\alpha}}}$$

For $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ we have

$$|A^\alpha w|_{L^{\frac{6}{1+2\alpha}}} \le C_S(1-\alpha)|A^\alpha w|_{1-\alpha,2\pi} = C_S(1-\alpha)|A^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}}w|_{0,2\pi}, \tag{2.10}$$

where the equality in (2.10) follows from (2.2). Combine the above two estimates to get via the Sobolev-Poincaré inequality

$$|\langle B(a,b), A^{\alpha}w\rangle_{0,2\pi}| \le (2\pi)^{-d} C_S(1-\alpha) C_S(1) |a|_{1,2\pi} |\nabla b|_{L^{\frac{3}{2-\alpha}}} |A^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}} w|_{0,2\pi} \tag{2.11}$$

for $\alpha \in [0,1]$. Estimate (2.11) is the $Q_{2\pi}$-case of (2.8). Similarly we get $Q_{2\pi}$-case of (2.9), namely writing

$$|v|_{L^{\frac{3}{2-\alpha}}} \le C_S\left(\alpha - \frac{1}{2}\right) |v|_{\alpha-\frac{1}{2},2\pi} \le C_S\left(\alpha - \frac{1}{2}\right) |v|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\alpha-1,2\pi} |v|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\alpha,2\pi}, \tag{2.12}$$

where the later inequality follows from an interpolation, with constant 1 in view of the definition of the norm $|\cdot|_{s,L}$.

Step 2. (a general L by rescaling) For $h : Q_L \to \mathbb{R}^3$, let us denote its dilation $h_{\frac{2\pi}{L}} : Q_{2\pi} \to \mathbb{R}^3$ with $\bar{h}$. Recall from subsection 2.1 that the Fourier coefficients of h and $\bar{h}$ are identical. Hence $|a|_{\beta,L} = |\bar{a}|_{\beta,2\pi}$, $A^{\beta} w = \left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{\beta} A^{\beta} \bar{w}$. One has

$$|\langle B(a,b), A^{\alpha}w\rangle_{0,L}| = \left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{\alpha+\frac{1}{2}} |\langle B(\bar{a},\bar{b}), A^{\alpha}\bar{w}\rangle_{0,2\pi}| \le$$

$$(2\pi)^{-d}\left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{\alpha+\frac{1}{2}} C_S(1-\alpha) C_S(1) |\bar{a}|_{1,2\pi} |\nabla \bar{b}|_{L^{\frac{3}{2-\alpha}}(Q_{2\pi})} |A^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}} \bar{w}|_{0,2\pi} =:$$

$$(2\pi)^{-d}\left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{\alpha+\frac{1}{2}} C_S(1-\alpha) C_S(1)\ I,$$

where the inequality follows from step 1. In order to scale back I to Q_L, we need to know how Lebesgue norms behave under scaling. It holds

$$|\nabla b|_{L^p(Q_L)} = \left(\frac{L}{2\pi}\right)^{\frac{d}{p}-1} |\nabla \bar{b}|_{L^p(Q_{2\pi})}.$$

Taking this into consideration, we get

$$I = \left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{-\alpha} |a|_{1,L} |\nabla b|_{L^{\frac{3}{2-\alpha}}(Q_L)} |A^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}} \omega|_{0,L}.$$

Altogether, the formulas that involve I yield

$$\left|\langle B(a,b), A^{\alpha}w\rangle_{0,L}\right| \le \frac{2\pi}{L}(2\pi)^{-d} C_S(1-\alpha) C_S(1) |a|_{1,L} |\nabla b|_{L^{\frac{3}{2-\alpha}}(Q_L)} |A^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}} \omega|_{0,L},$$

which is (2.8). Analogously we get (2.9), because

$$|v|_{L^{\frac{3}{2-\alpha}}(Q_L)} = \left(\frac{L}{2\pi}\right)^{2-\alpha} |\bar{v}|_{L^{\frac{3}{2-\alpha}}(Q_{2\pi})} \le \left(\frac{L}{2\pi}\right)^{2-\alpha} C_S\left(\alpha - \frac{1}{2}\right) |\bar{v}|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\alpha-1,2\pi} |\bar{v}|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\alpha,2\pi}.$$

□

Next, let us present a result that facilitates the desired scaling-invariance of constants in Corollary 1. To formulate it, we need

Definition 2. *$C_I(\alpha, T)$ is a constant of the following 2π-normalized interpolation inequality*

$$|\nabla f|_{L^4(0,T;L^{\frac{3}{2-\alpha}}(Q_{2\pi}))} \leq C_I(\alpha,T)|f|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{L^\infty(0,T;|\cdot|_{\alpha,2\pi})}|f|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{L^2(0,T;|\cdot|_{1+\alpha,2\pi})}.$$

The above interpolation holds for

$$f \in L^\infty(0,T;\dot{H}^\alpha(Q_{2\pi})) \cap L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^{1+\alpha}(Q_{2\pi}))$$

in view of

(i) The standard interpolation inequality for integro-differential norms.

(ii) The Poincaré inequality that allows us to write homogeneous Sobolev integro-differential seminorms in the r.h.s. of the interpolation inequality from (i). (Elements of $\dot{H}^\beta$ can be identified with these of H^β that have null mean value).

(iii) The equivalence of integro-differential and Fourier-based norms.

Rescaling the above interpolation formula, we obtain

Proposition 2. *Assume that $u \in L^\infty(0,T;\dot{H}^\alpha(Q_L)) \cap L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^{1+\alpha}(Q_L))$. Then*

$$|\nabla u|_{L^4(0,T;L^{\frac{3}{2-\alpha}}(Q_L))} \leq C_I(\alpha,T)\left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}}|u|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{L^\infty(0,T;|\cdot|_{\alpha,L})}|u|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{L^2(0,T;|\cdot|_{1+\alpha,L})}.$$

3. Stability

We are ready to prove Theorem 1. Recall that we work with a given $T_* > 0$ and α-strong solution u to (NS_{f,u_0}) that exists on $[0,T_*)$ as well as a Leray-Hopf weak solution v to (NS_{g,v_0}). The system for the difference $w := u - v$ reads

$$\begin{cases} w_{,t} + \nu Aw + B(w,u) + B(u,w) - B(w,w) = h \\ \mathrm{div} w = 0 \\ w(0) = u_0 - v_0 \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

with $h = f - g$. In subsection 3.1 we will derive higher–order estimates for (3.1) (more precisely, α-order estimates). Next, we conclude the proof via a blowup argument in subsection 3.2.

3.1. Energy estimates

We are going to test (3.1) with $A^\alpha w$.

3.1.1. Admissibility of testing with $A^\alpha w$

Let us first comment on rigorousness of our estimates. We restrict ourselves to the time interval $[0, T_*(g, v_0) \wedge T_*)$, where $T_*(g, v_0)$ denotes the blowup time of the α-strong solution to (NS_{g,v_0}), given by Theorem 2. This solution coincides on the interval $[0, T_*(g, v_0))$ with the interesting for us Leray-Hopf weak solution v, again thanks to Theorem 2 (its uniqueness part). Hence

$$w = u - v \in L^2(0, T_*(g, v_0) \wedge T_*; \dot{H}^{1+\alpha}(Q_L)).$$

Consequently

(i) $A^\alpha w$ is admissible as a test function to νAw in (3.1).

Next, for $\alpha \geq 1/2$ it holds

$$A^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} w_{,t} \in L^2(0, T_*(g, v_0) \wedge T_*; \dot{H}^{-1}_{\mathrm{div}}(Q_L)),$$

thanks to an analogous argument, as the one for formulas (4.9) and (4.10), used for w. This and the already known

$$A^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} w \in L^2(0, T_*(g, v_0) \wedge T_*; \dot{H}^1(Q_L))$$

allows us to write

$$\langle A^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} w_{,t}\,(t), A^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} w(t)\rangle_{-1,1;L} = \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}|A^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} w|^2_{0,L}(t). \tag{3.2}$$

Identity (3.2) is the Fourier-series version of the known integro-differential formula for a generalized differentiation of a product, compare for instance Lemma 2.2.5 of [Pok]. Hence

(ii) By (3.2) we have justified the admissibility of $A^\alpha w$ as a test function to the evolutionary part of (3.1).

Observe that the above justification works well only for α-order estimates for $\alpha \geq 1/2$. Otherwise we do not have sufficient regularity information on $w_{,t}$ to use the duality formula (3.2). For instance for $\alpha = 0$, one has $u, v \in L^2(\dot{H}^1)$ and $u_{,t}\,, v_{,t} \in L^{\frac{4}{3}}(\dot{H}^{-1})$ (see Lemma 1). In order to have the duality formula (3.2) with such low regularity of the time derivative, we would need to assume $u, v \in L^4(\dot{H}^1)$ (which is already well within the Ladyzhenskaya-Prodi-Serrin class). In this case one can justify the estimates differently, see [CDGG], proof of Theorem 3.3, in particular pages 61-63.
Finally,

(iii) Testing the nonlinear and force terms of (3.1) with $A^\alpha w$ is admissible. This can be seen directly in the estimates (3.4)–(3.7) below.

3.1.2. Estimates

Testing (3.1) with $A^\alpha w$, we get at a.a. $t \in [0, T_*(g, v_0) \wedge T_*)$

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}|A^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}w|^2_{0,L} + \nu|A^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}}w|^2_{0,L} \leq \\ &|\langle h, A^\alpha w\rangle_{-1,1;L}| + |\langle B(w,u) + B(u,w) - B(w,w), A^\alpha w\rangle_{-1,1;L}|. \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

Let us estimate the force term as follows

$$|\langle h, A^\alpha w\rangle_{-1,1;L}| = |\langle A^{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}}h, A^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}}w\rangle_{0,0;L}| \leq \varepsilon_2|A^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}}w|^2_{0,L} + \frac{1}{4\varepsilon_2}|A^{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}}h|^2_{0,L}. \tag{3.4}$$

To control the nonlinear terms we use (2.8) of Proposition 1 and get

$$\begin{aligned} I &:= |\langle B(w,u), A^\alpha w\rangle_{-1,1;L}| \leq K_{(2.8)}(\alpha, L)|w|_{1,L}|\nabla u|_{L^{\frac{3}{2-\alpha}}(Q_L)}|A^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}}w|_{0,L} \\ &\leq K_{(2.8)}(\alpha, L)|w|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{1-\alpha,L}|w|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{1+\alpha,L}|\nabla u|_{L^{\frac{3}{2-\alpha}}(Q_L)}|A^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}}w|_{0,L} \\ &\leq K_{(2.8)}(\alpha, L)\left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{-\frac{1+\alpha}{4}}|w|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{1-\alpha,L}|\nabla u|_{\frac{3}{2-\alpha}(Q_L)}|A^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}}w|^{\frac{3}{2}}_{0,L}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

In (3.5) we use also interpolation of $|\cdot|_1$ between $|\cdot|_{1-\alpha}|\cdot|_{1+\alpha}$ with constant 1 (which follows from the definition of $|\cdot|_{s,L}$ and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality) and (2.2). Observe that the term containing u is finite for a.e. t thanks to Proposition 2. Similarly

$$\begin{aligned} II &:= |\langle B(u,w), A^\alpha w\rangle_{-1,1;L}| \\ &\leq K_{(2.8)}(\alpha, L)K_{(2.9)}(\alpha, L)|u|_{1,L}|\nabla w|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\alpha-1,L}|\nabla w|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\alpha,L}|A^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}}\omega|_{0,L} \\ &= K_{(2.8)}(\alpha, L)K_{(2.9)}(\alpha, L)\left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}|u|_{1,L}|w|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\alpha,L}|w|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\alpha+1,L}|A^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}}w|_{0,L} \\ &\leq K_{(2.8)}(\alpha, L)K_{(2.9)}(\alpha, L)\left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}|u|_{1,L}|w|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\alpha,L}\left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{-\frac{1+\alpha}{4}}|A^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}}w|^{\frac{3}{2}}_{0,L}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

for the equality above we use '$A^{\frac{1}{2}} = |\nabla|$' and (2.2) and for the last inequality again (2.2). We begin the estimate of the last nonlinear part of (3.3) by invoking (3.6) with $u := w$

$$\begin{aligned} III &:= |\langle B(w,w), A^\alpha w\rangle_{-1,1;L}| \\ &\leq K_{(2.8)}(\alpha, L)K_{(2.9)}(\alpha, L)\left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{4}}|w|_{1,L}|w|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\alpha,L}|A^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}}w|^{\frac{3}{2}}_{0,L} \\ &\leq K_{(2.8)}(\alpha, L)K_{(2.9)}(\alpha, L)\left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}|w|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{1-\alpha,L}|w|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\alpha,L}|A^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}}w|^2_{0,L}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

where for the second inequality we interpolate $|w|_{1,L} \le |w|^{\frac12}_{1-\alpha,L}|w|^{\frac12}_{1+\alpha,L}$ and use (2.2).

Estimates (3.4)–(3.7) plugged into (3.3) yield

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac12\frac{d}{dt}|A^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}w|^2_{0,L} + \nu|A^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}}w|^2_{0,L} \le \varepsilon_2|A^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}}w|^2_{0,L} + \frac{1}{4\varepsilon_2}|A^{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}}h|^2_{0,L}\\
&+ K_{(2.8)}(\alpha,L)|A^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}}w|^{\frac32}_{0,L}\left[\left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{-\frac{1+\alpha}{4}}|w|^{\frac12}_{1-\alpha,L}|\nabla u|_{L^{\frac{3}{2-\alpha}}(Q_L)}\right.\\
&+ K_{(2.9)}(\alpha,L)\left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{4}}|u|_{1,L}|w|^{\frac12}_{\alpha,L}\\
&\left.+ K_{(2.9)}(\alpha,L)\left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}|w|^{\frac12}_{1-\alpha,L}|w|^{\frac12}_{\alpha,L}|A^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}}w|^{\frac12}_{0,L}\right]
\end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

In (3.8) we need the restriction $\alpha \in \big[1/2, 1\big]$, because we have used Proposition 1. Observe that the last summand of (3.8) gives the critically growing term $|A^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}}w|^2_{0,L}$. Therefore it may seem more natural to stop estimate (3.7) for III at the first inequality and have in consequence the subcritical $|A^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}}w|^{\frac32}_{0,L}$ instead. Then, however, one needs to deal with higher powers of the lower-order-terms. It is possible in case $\alpha = 1$, but we prefer to keep the energy estimate in the form (3.8) and argue for the entire range $\alpha \in \big[1/2, 1\big]$ at once.

In the last-but-one term on the r.h.s. of (3.8) let us use

$$|u|_{1,L} = L^{-\frac{d}{2}}\left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{-\frac12}|\nabla u|_{L^2(Q_L)} \le L^{-\frac{d}{2}}\left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{-\frac12}L^{\frac{d(2\alpha-1)}{6}}|\nabla u|_{L^{\frac{3}{2-\alpha}}(Q_L)},$$

which follows from (1.1) and the Hölder inequality. This and $|f|_{1-\alpha,L} \le |f|_{\alpha,L}$, valid for $\alpha \ge 1/2$, yields from (3.8) via (2.2)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac12\frac{d}{dt}|A^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}w|^2_{0,L} + \nu|A^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}}w|^2_{0,L} \le \varepsilon_2|A^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}}w|^2_{0,L} + \frac{1}{4\varepsilon_2}|A^{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}}h|^2_{0,L} +\\
&K_{(2.8)}(\alpha,L)|A^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}}w|^{\frac32}_{0,L}|w|^{\frac12}_{\alpha,L}|\nabla u|_{L^{\frac{3}{2-\alpha}}(Q_L)}\left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{-\frac{1+\alpha}{4}}\left[1 + K_{(2.9)}(\alpha,L)L^{\frac{d(\alpha-2)}{3}}\right]\\
&+ K_{(2.8)}(\alpha,L)K_{(2.9)}(\alpha,L)\left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}|w|_{\alpha,L}|A^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}}w|^2_{0,L}
\end{aligned}$$

Expressing above all the norms of fractional derivatives by the norms of a respective

homogenous Sobolev space via (2.2), we arrive at

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}|w|^2_{\alpha,L}+\nu\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}|w|^2_{\alpha+1,L}\le\varepsilon_2\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}|w|^2_{\alpha+1,L}+\frac{1}{4\varepsilon_2}\left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{-1}|h|^2_{\alpha-1,L}$$
$$+\left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{\frac{3-\alpha}{4}}|w|^{\frac{3}{2}}_{\alpha+1,L}|w|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\alpha,L}|\nabla u|_{L^{\frac{3}{2-\alpha}}(Q_L)}$$
$$\times\left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{-\frac{1+\alpha}{4}}K_{(2.8)}(\alpha,L)\left[1+K_{(2.9)}(\alpha,L)L^{\frac{d(\alpha-2)}{3}}\right]$$
$$+K_{(2.8)}(\alpha,L)K_{(2.9)}(\alpha,L)\left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}|w|_{\alpha,L}|w|^2_{1+\alpha,L}.$$

Let us define

$$X:=\frac{1}{2}|w|^2_{\alpha,L},\qquad Y:=\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}|w|^2_{\alpha+1,L},$$
$$U:=|\nabla u|^4_{L^{\frac{3}{2-\alpha}}(Q_L)},\quad H:=|h|^2_{\alpha-1,L}.$$

The Young inequality

$$Y^{\frac{3}{4}}c(XU)^{\frac{1}{4}}\le\varepsilon_1 Y+\varepsilon_1^{-3}\frac{27}{256}c^4XU$$

used in the third term of the preceding inequality allows us to write

$$\dot{X}+(\nu-\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2)Y\le K_4H+K_3XU+K_2X^{\frac{1}{2}}Y, \tag{3.9}$$

where

$$K_2=\sqrt{2}K_{(2.8)}(\alpha,L)K_{(2.9)}(\alpha,L)\left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}},$$
$$K_3=\varepsilon_1^{-3}\frac{27}{128}K^4_{(2.8)}(\alpha,L)\left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{-2\alpha-1}\left[1+K_{(2.9)}(\alpha,L)L^{\frac{d(\alpha-2)}{3}}\right]^4,$$
$$K_4=\frac{1}{4\varepsilon_2}\left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{-1}.$$

The above choices agree with the definition of K_2, K_3, K_4 in subsection 1.2. To see this, consider the formulas for $K_{(2.8)}(\alpha,L)$, $K_{(2.9)}(\alpha,L)$ as in subsection 2.5. The ODI (3.9) will give us stability via a blowup argument.

3.2. Proof of Theorem 1 via the blowup argument

Recall that assumptions of Theorem 1 fix a positive T that satisfies $T < T_*$, where T_* is the given time of existence of the reference α-strong solution u. The proximity assumption (A1) reads

$$\left(|u_0 - v_0|^2_{\alpha,L} + K_4 \int_0^T |f-g|^2_{\alpha-1,L}(t)\,dt\right) \mathrm{e}^{K_3 \int_0^T |\nabla u(t)|^4_{L^{\frac{3}{2-\alpha}}(Q_L)}\,dt} < \left(\frac{\bar\nu}{K_2}\right)^2,$$

where $\bar\nu$ is any positive number that satisfies $\bar\nu < \nu - \varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2$.

Step 1. (a lower bound for $T_*(g, v_0)$.) Let us show that

$$T_*(g, v_0) > T.$$

Assume the contrary: $T_*(g, v_0) \le T$ ($< T_*(f, u_0)$). Let

$$\mu := \nu - \varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2 - \bar\nu,$$

positive by our assumptions. Hence the proximity assumption (A1) gives

$$X(0) < \left(\frac{\bar\nu}{K_2}\right)^2 = \left(\frac{\nu - \varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2 - \mu}{K_2}\right)^2.$$

We face now the following alternative

(i) either $X(t) \le \left(\frac{\nu-\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2-\mu}{K_2}\right)^2$ for $t \in [0, T_*(g, v_0))$

(ii) or $X(t)$ exceeds $\left(\frac{\nu-\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2-\mu}{K_2}\right)^2$ on $[0, T_*(g, v_0))$. Thanks to continuity of X on $[0, T_*(v))$ and the fact that it starts below $\left(\frac{\nu-\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2-\mu}{K_2}\right)^2$, there exists the minimal positive time $\bar t \in (0, T_*(v))$ such that $X(\bar t) = \left(\frac{\nu-\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2-\mu}{K_2}\right)^2$.

Keeping this in mind, observe that ODI (3.9) reads

$$\dot X + (\nu - \varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2 - K_2 X^{\frac12}) Y \le K_3 X U + K_4 H.$$

It implies for almost any $t \le T_*(g, v_0)$ (case (i)) or for almost any $t \le \bar t$ (case (ii)) that $\dot X + \mu Y \le K_3 X U + K_4 H$. Consequently

$$\begin{aligned} X(t) + \mu \int_0^t Y &\le \left(X(0) + K_4 \int_0^t H\right) \mathrm{e}^{K_3 \int_0^t U(s)ds} \\ &\le \left(X(0) + K_4 \int_0^T H\right) \mathrm{e}^{K_3 \int_0^T U(s)ds} < \left(\frac{\tilde\nu}{K_2}\right)^2, \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

where the third inequality follows from our assumption (A1).

In the case (i), we drop the first summand of the l.h.s. of (3.10), so $\mu \int_0^t Y < \left(\frac{\bar\nu}{K_2}\right)^2$ for any $t < T_*(g, v_0)$, hence

$$\int_0^{T_*(g,v_0)} Y \le \frac{1}{\mu}\left(\frac{\bar\nu}{K_2}\right)^2 < +\infty.$$

Since in the case (i) one assumes also that the continuous $X(t) \le \left(\frac{\bar\nu}{K_2}\right)^2$ on $[0, T_*(v))$, $T_*(v)$ can not be a blowup time.

In the case (ii) we have $X(\bar t) < \left(\frac{\bar\nu}{K_2}\right)^2$ from (3.10), but $X(\bar t) = \left(\frac{\bar\nu}{K_2}\right)^2$ here, which is a contradiction.

As neither (i) nor (ii) can hold, we have contradicted $T_*(g, v_0) \le T$.

Step 2. (proximity estimate) We already know that $T_*(g, v_0) > T$. Therefore we rewrite the alternative from the previous step, plugging there T in place of $T_*(g, v_0)$. Case (ii) is again a contradiction, so (3.10) holds, for any $t < T$. We know that $T < T^*(g, v_0)$, so we can let $t \to T$ in (3.10). This gives (P1). □

3.2. Proof of Corollary 1

It follows from Proposition 2 in subsection 2.5 and (A1).

4. Regularity

Here we prove our theorems on existence of strong solutions to (NS_{f,u_0}).

4.1. Proof of Theorem 2

This theorem serves as an auxiliary result for our main Theorem 1, therefore its proof has been postponed until now. Nevertheless, the approach for proving both Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 is similar. In the former one we had the blowup argument basing on the reference solution u. Here, the approximate solution u^m related to (NS_{f,u_0}) (defined below) will play the role of a regular reference. Recall subsection 2.2, for $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$ we denote by

$$P_k : \dot H^0_{\mathrm{div}}(Q) \to \mathrm{span}\{e^{2\pi i k\cdot \frac{x}{L}} : k \le k_0\}$$

the projection on the low-frequency space. The approximate solution u^m related to (NS_{f,u_0}) is the solution of the ODE

$$\begin{cases} u^m_{,t} - \nu\Delta u^m + P_m(B(u^m, u^m)) = P_m f, \\ \nabla \cdot u^m = 0, \\ u^m(0) = P_m u_0. \end{cases}$$

compare page 57 of [CDGG]. As we are already familiar with the proof method and we follow closely the proof of Theorem 3.5 in [CDGG] (except for the step 5), we omit some details in the considerations below.

Step 1. (splitting the initial data) Let us consider the projection P_{k_0}, whose k_0 will be fixed later and decompose the initial datum u_0 into $u_0^{Lo} = P_{k_0}u_0$ and $u_0^{Hi} = u_0 - P_{k_0}u_0$, whereas the former evolve with the homogenous Stokes, which degenerates in our setting to the homogenous heat system, i.e. to

$$\begin{cases} u_{,t}^{Lo} + \nu A u^{Lo} = 0, \\ u^{Lo}(0) = u_0^{Lo}. \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

Observe that for a low frequency data u_0^{Lo} the above Stokes problem admits an exact finite Fourier series solution u^{Lo} that belongs to $P_{k_0}(\dot{H}^0_{\mathrm{div}})$. Let us choose any $m \geq k_0$ and consider the approximate solution u^m related to (NS_{f,u_0}). Then $u^m - u^{Lo} := u^{m,Hi}$ solves

$$\begin{cases} u_{,t}^{m,Hi} - \nu\Delta u^{m,Hi} + \\ P_m[(B(u^{m,Hi}, u^{m,Hi})) + B(u^{m,Hi}, u^{Lo}) + B(u^{Lo}, u^{m,Hi})] = F, \\ \nabla \cdot u^{m,Hi} = 0, \\ u^{m,Hi}(0) = P_m(u_0^{Hi}) = P_m u_0 - P_{k_0}u_0. \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$

with $F = P_m f - P_m[B(u^{Lo}, u^{Lo})]$.

Step 2. (derivation of an ODI) System (4.2) is formally equivalent to (3.1) with $P_m B$ in place of B and $w := u^{m,Hi}$, $u := u^{Lo}$, $f := F$. Our 'eigenvalue definition' of A^α reduces testing (4.2) with $A^\alpha u^{m,Hi}$ to multiplying a system of ODEs with

$$\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d\setminus\{0\}, |k|\leq m} \lambda_k^\alpha u_k^{m,Hi} \cdot \omega_{L,k},$$

hence the estimates of subsection 3.1 are justified also for (4.2). Consequently, along lines of Section 3 we obtain an analogue of the ODI (3.9)

$$\dot{X}_m + (\nu - \varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2)Y_m \leq K_2 X_m^{\frac{1}{2}} Y_m + K_3 X_m U + K_4 H_m,$$

with

$$X_m := \frac{1}{2}|u^{m,Hi}|^2_{\alpha,L}, \qquad Y_m := \frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}|u^{m,Hi}|^2_{\alpha+1,L},$$
$$U^{Lo} := |\nabla u^{Lo}|^4_{L^{\frac{3}{2-\alpha}}(Q_L)}, \quad H_m := |P_m f|^2_{\alpha-1,L} + K_5(u^{Lo})X_m^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where

$$K_5(u^{Lo}) = \sqrt{2}\left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{\alpha+\frac{1}{2}} |u^{Lo} \otimes u^{Lo}|_{1+\alpha,L}.$$

The $K_5(u^{Lo})$ term of the forcing H_m follows from $P_m[B(u^{Lo},u^{Lo})]$ part of F. Namely, it holds

$$|\langle P_m[B(u^{Lo},u^{Lo})],A^\alpha u^{m,Hi}\rangle| \le |\mathrm{div}(u^{Lo}\otimes u^{Lo})|_{\alpha,L}|A^\alpha u^{m,Hi}|_{-\alpha,L}$$

Since div is the (scalar) multiplication with $k\big(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\big)^{\frac12}$ and (2.2) is valid, we get

$$|\langle P_m[B(u^{Lo},u^{Lo})],A^\alpha u^{m,Hi}\rangle| \le \left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{\frac12+\alpha}|u^{Lo}\otimes u^{Lo}|_{1+\alpha,L}|u^{m,Hi}|_{\alpha,L},$$

hence the $K_5(u^{Lo})$ term in H_m. Let us rewrite now our ODI as follows

$$\dot X_m + (\nu-\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2-K_2X_m^{\frac12})Y_m \le X_m[K_3U^{Lo}+\delta]+\frac{1}{4\delta}K_5^2(u^{Lo}). \tag{4.3}$$

Step 3. (gaining a smallness) Since u^{Lo} solves the linear heat system, we control U^{Lo} and $K_5(u^{Lo})$ in terms of u_0^{Lo}. Thanks to splitting u^m into $u^{m,Hi}$ and u^{Lo} we can now gain smallness of $X_m(0)=\frac12|P_mu_0-P_{k_0}u_0|^2_{\alpha,L}$. Namely, let us fix a positive $\mu<\nu-\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2$ and choose k_0 large enough so that for any $m\ge k_0$ holds

$$\nu-\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2-K_2X_m^{\frac12}(0)\ge\mu \Leftrightarrow X_m(0)\le\left(\frac{\nu-\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2-\mu}{K_2}\right)^2. \tag{4.4}$$

Step 4. (m-uniform α-regularity bound) Fix any $\sigma\in(0,1)$. By time continuity of X_m, there exists T_m such that $\nu-\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2-K_2X_m^{\frac12}(t)\ge\sigma\mu$ for $t\in[0,T_m]$. It implies in (4.3)

$$\dot X_m+\sigma Y_m\le X_m[K_3U^{Lo}+\delta]+\frac{1}{4\delta}K_5^2(u^{Lo})$$

for $t\le T_m$, i.e.

$$X_m(t)+\sigma\int_0^t Y_m\le\left(X_m(0)+\frac{1}{4\delta}\int_0^t K_5^2(u^{Lo})\,d\tau\right)e^{\int_0^t(K_3U(\tau)+\delta)d\tau}. \tag{4.5}$$

Since in view of (4.4) $X_m(0)\le\big(\frac{\nu-\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2-\mu}{K_2}\big)^2$, there exists $T_0>0$ such that r.h.s. of (4.5) stays below $\big(\frac{\nu-\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2-\sigma\mu}{K_2}\big)^2$ for $t\le T_0$ small enough. Consequently

$$X_m(t)\le\left(\frac{\nu-\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2-\sigma\mu}{K_2}\right)^2\Leftrightarrow\nu-\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2-K_2X_m^{\frac12}(t)\ge\sigma\mu \tag{4.6}$$

for $t\le T_0$ and independently from m.

Using (4.6) in (4.3) allows to conclude that (4.5) holds for $t\le T_0$ uniformly in m. Thus we have an additional $L^\infty(\dot H^\alpha)\cap L^2(\dot H^{1+\alpha})$ estimate for $u^{m,H}$, hence u^m, uniform for $m\ge k_0$.

Step 5. (time-continuity $C(\dot{H}^\alpha)$). In this step we do not need a precise control over constants. Conseqently C denotes a general constant, that may vary between lines. Let us divert from [CDGG] and use the following duality estimate for the weak solution (2.5) to $(NS)_{f,u_0}$

$$\begin{aligned} &\Big| \int_0^T \langle u_{,t}\,,\varphi\rangle_{-1,1;L}\Big| \\ &\le C\int_0^T \big(|f|_{\alpha-1,L}|\varphi|_{1-\alpha,L} + |\nabla u|_{\alpha,L}|\nabla\varphi|_{-\alpha,L} + |\mathrm{div}(u\otimes u)|_{\alpha-1,L}|\varphi|_{1-\alpha,L}\big). \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

The last summand above can be estimated by

$$\int_0^T |u\otimes u|_{\alpha,L}|\varphi|_{1-\alpha,L} \le C\bigg(\int_0^T\int_{Q_L} |A^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}u|^{\frac{10}{3}}\bigg)^{\frac{3}{5}}\bigg(\int_0^T\int_{Q_L}|u|^5\bigg)^{\frac{2}{5}}|\varphi|_{L^2(|\cdot|_{1-\alpha})} \tag{4.8}$$

using Hölder inequality. Plugging (4.8) into (4.7) gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\Big| \int_0^T \langle u_{,t}\,,\varphi\rangle_{-1,1;L}\Big| \le \\ &C|\varphi|_{L^2(|\cdot|_{1-\alpha})}\big[|f|_{L^2(|\cdot|_{\alpha-1})} + |u|_{L^2(|\cdot|_{1+\alpha})} + |A^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}u|_{L^{\frac{10}{3}}(L^{\frac{10}{3}})}|u|^2_{L^5(L^5)}\big]. \end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

The norms on the r.h.s. of (4.9) are finite thanks to our assumption related to f and to the $L^\infty(\dot{H}^\alpha)\cap L^2(\dot{H}^{1+\alpha})$ estimate from previous steps for u. Specifically, the last summand in (4.9) is finite by parabolic embedding ($L^{\frac{10}{3}}$ norm) and by interpolation

$$L^\infty(\dot{H}^\alpha)\cap L^2(\dot{H}^{1+\alpha}) \hookrightarrow L^5(\dot{H}^{\alpha+\frac{2}{5}}) \hookrightarrow L^5(L^5)$$

for $\alpha \ge 1/2$. Hence (4.9) means that

$$u_{,t} \in (L^2(\dot{H}^{1-\alpha}_{\mathrm{div}}))^* = L^2(\dot{H}^{\alpha-1}_{\mathrm{div}}). \tag{4.10}$$

This information interpolated (in the sense of 'espaces des traces', see for instance Lemma 2.2.4 in [Pok]) with $u\in L^2(H^{\alpha+1}_{\mathrm{div}})$ yields $u\in C(\dot{H}^\alpha)$.

Step 6. (uniqueness) The $L^\infty(\dot{H}^\alpha)$ regularity implies for $\alpha\ge 1/2$ that we are in the Prodi-Serrin class, where Leray-Hopf solutions are unique.

Step 7. (blowup criterion) Assume on the contrary that $T_*(u_0,f)$ is the maximum existence time and at the same time

$$\max_{t\le T_*(u_0,f)} |u(t)|_{\alpha,L} < \infty$$

then, by definition of the $C(I;V)$-Bochner norm, $u\in C([0,T_*(u_0,f)];\dot{H}^\alpha)$. In particular, we can restart the evolution from $u(T_*(u_0,f))\in\dot{H}^\alpha$ and in view of steps 1–6, there exists $T_1 > T_*(u_0,f)$ and the unique (in Leray-Hopf class)

$$C([T_*(u_0,f),T_1],\dot{H}^\alpha_{\mathrm{div}})\cap L^2(T_*(u_0,f),T_1,\dot{H}^{1+\alpha}_{\mathrm{div}})$$

solution to $(NS_{f,u(T_*(u_0,f))})$. It satisfies for a.a. $t\in[0,T_1]$ the weak formulation (2.6). Therefore it is a weak solution on $[0,T_1)$ to (NS_{f,u_0}). Hence $T_*(u_0,f)$ is not the maximal existence time. □

4.2. Proof of Lemma 1

Here we prove the caloric lower bound for $T_*(f, u_0)$. From (4.5) in the step 4 of the proof of Theorem 2, we see that any $T_0 > 0$ that yields

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(\left(\frac{\nu-\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2-\mu}{K_2}\right)^2+\frac{1}{4\delta}\int_0^{T_0}K_5^2(u^{Lo}(\tau))\,d\tau\right)e^{\int_0^{T_0}(K_3U(\tau)+\delta)d\tau}\\&\leq\left(\frac{\nu-\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2-\sigma\mu}{K_2}\right)^2\end{aligned}\tag{4.11}$$

provides the m-independent bound

$$\sup_{t\leq T_0}X_m(t)+\sigma\int_0^{T_0}Y_m\leq\left(\frac{\nu-\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2-\sigma\mu}{K_2}\right)^2.\tag{4.12}$$

Let us reformulate (4.11) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(\frac{K_2}{\nu-\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2-\sigma\mu}\right)^2\frac{1}{4\delta}\int_0^{T_0}K_5^2(u^{Lo})\,d\tau\leq\\&e^{-\int_0^{T_0}(K_3U(\tau)+\delta)d\tau}-\left(\frac{(1-\sigma)\mu}{\nu-\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2-\sigma\mu}-1\right)^2,\end{aligned}$$

which clarifies (A3), after one takes into account the formulas

$$K_5^2(u^{Lo})=2\left(\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{2\alpha+1}|u^{Lo}\otimes u^{Lo}|^2_{1+\alpha,L},$$

$$U^{Lo}:=|\nabla u^{Lo}(\tau)|^4_{L^{\frac{3}{2-\alpha}}(Q_L)},$$

as in the step 4 of the proof of Theorem 2. The remaining to prove bound follows from (4.12). □

4.3. Proof of Theorem 3

Currently we find ourselves in an easier situation than when proving Theorem 2, because splitting the initial data to gain smallness is unnecessary - a smallness is already assumed. Hence we get for the Fourier approximations u^m

$$\dot{X}_m+(\nu-\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2-K_2X_m^{\frac{1}{2}})Y_m\leq K_4H,$$

with

$$X_m:=\frac{1}{2}|u^m|^2_{\alpha,L},\quad Y_m:=\frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}|u^m|^2_{\alpha+1,L},\quad H:=|f|^2_{\alpha-1,L},$$

compare the computations that provided (4.3) in step 2 of the proof of Theorem 2. We finish our proof via a blowup argument, analogously to the proof of our stability result, compare subsection 3.1. In fact Theorem 3 can be seen also as a stability result with null initial data and null reference solution u in $(A1)$. □

5. Concluding remarks

Let us recall from our introduction that the most ambitious task related to stability studies of Navier-Stokes is to obtain regularity *in the large* by stability. Some of the ideas how to complete this task are related to so called *schemes for numerical verification of regularity*. They were first presented in Chernyshenko, Constantin, Robinson & Titi [CCRT], further generalized in Dashti & Robinson [DR] and refined in Marín-Rubio, Robinson & Sadowski [M-RRS]. Some remarks on these schemes follow, in relation to our results.

5.1. A posteriori numerical verification of regularity

Let us consider an approximate solution to unforced (NS_{0,u_0}). To fix ideas, let the superscript $\cdot^n$ denote the projection of u_0 on $\omega_{L,k}$, $k = 1, \dots, n$. The n-th approximation starts at u_0^n. It is smooth and satisfies

$$\begin{cases} u,_t^n + u^n \cdot \nabla u^n - \nu \Delta u^n + \nabla p^n = u^n \cdot \nabla u^n - (u^n \cdot \nabla u^n)^n \\ \mathrm{div} u^n = 0 \\ u^n(0) = u_0^n \end{cases}$$

Using stability formula $(A1)$ for u_n as the reference smooth solution, we have that u is smooth, provided

$$\left(|u_0^n - u_0|^2_{\alpha,L} + K_4 \int_0^T |u^n \cdot \nabla u^n - (u^n \cdot \nabla u^n)^n|^2_{\alpha-1,L}(t)\, dt \right) \mathrm{e}^{K_3 \int_0^T |\nabla u^n(t)|^4_{L^{\frac{3}{2-\alpha}}(Q_L)} dt} < \frac{\bar{\nu}^2}{K_2^2} \qquad (C)$$

Hence to conclude that u is regular, one needs to find n such that condition (C) holds. The term involving initial condition vanishes, but the rest is troublesome. Up to now, one copes with them in the case $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ and $u_0 \in H^1$ (observe a mismatch in regularity for data and for stability) *assuming a priori that u is regular*, which implies that

$$\int_0^T |u^n \cdot \nabla u^n - (u^n \cdot \nabla u^n)^n|^2_{\alpha-1,L}(t)\, dt$$

vanishes and that

$$\int_0^T |\nabla u^n(t)|^4_{L^{\frac{3}{2-\alpha}}(Q_L)} dt$$

is bounded; see Theorem 6 and Lemma 7 in [M-RRS]. This need for *a priori* assumption of smoothness of u is the main difficulty of this approach.

5.2. Further research

Let us finally make a few observations.
(i) It may be interesting to try to match the stability condition (C) *ad hoc* numerically, where our scaling may be helpful to speed up the computations by reshaping constants (recall formulas for K_3 and K_4). *Ad hoc numerically* means here that one checks whether (C) holds for some n by a numerical scheme. Consequently no assumption on regularity of u is needed, but there is no evidence by now that (C) can be verified numerically.
(ii) Even more interesting would be to falsify numerically the regularity assumption of u as follows: Assume that u starting from u_0 is regular and, using this regularity, provide a convergence rate of

$$\int_0^T |u^n \cdot \nabla u^n - (u^n \cdot \nabla u^n)^n|^2_{\alpha-1,L}(t)\, dt$$

to zero and the upper bound on

$$\int_0^T |\nabla u^n(t)|^4_{L^{\frac{3}{2-\alpha}}(Q_L)}\, dt.$$

This implies validity of (C) for $n \geq n_0$. If the numerics showed otherwise, it would indicate at lack of regularity.
(iii) Our introduction of more general α should allow to match the stability condition and the initial datum space with a certain $\alpha < 1$. It is the object of our current studies.

References

[ADT] Auscher, P., Dubois, S., Tchamitchian, P., *On the stability of global solutions to Navier-Stokes equations in the space*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) 83 (2004), no. 6, 673–697.

[BLNNT] Bardos, C., Lopes Filho, M. C., Niu, D., Nussenzveig Lopes, H. J.; Titi, E. S., *Stability of two-dimensional viscous incompressible flows under three-dimensional perturbations and inviscid symmetry breaking.* SIAM J. Math. Anal. 45 (2013), no. 3, 1871–1885.

[BdV] Beirão da Veiga, H., Secchi, P., *L^p-stability for the strong solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations in the whole space.* Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 98 (1987), no. 1, 65–69.

[CDGG] Chemin, J.-Y., Desjardins B., Gallagher, I., Grenier, E., *Mathematical geophysics*, Oxford 2006.

[CCRT] Chernyshenko, S., Constantin, P., Robinson, J., Titi, E., *A posteriori regularity of the three-dimensional Navier-Stokes from numerical computations*, Com. Math. Phys. 48 (2007), no. 6, 065204.

[CF] Constantin P., Foias, C., *Navier-Stokes Equations*, Chicago 1988.

[DR] Dashti, M., Robinson J., *An A Posteriori Condition on the Numerical Approximations of the Navier–Stokes Equations for the Existence of a Strong Solution*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 46(6), 3136–3150.

[ESŠ] Escauriaza, L., Seregin, G., Šverák, V., *$L^{3,\infty}$-solutions of Navier–Stokes equations and backward uniqueness*, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk 58 (2003), no 2 (350), 3–44.

[Gal] Galdi, G., *An introduction to the Navier-Stokes initial boundary value problem*, Birkhäuser, 2000.

[I] Iftimie, D., *The 3D Navier-Stokes equations seen as a perturbation of the 2D Navier-Stokes equations*, Bull. Soc. Math. France, 127 (1999), 473–517.

[KT] Koch, H., Tataru, D., *Well-posedness for the Navier-Stokes equations* Adv. Math. 157 (2001), no. 1, 22 – 35.

[M-RRS] Marín-Rubio, P., Robinson, J., Sadowski, W., *Solutions of the 3D Navier-Stokes equations for initial data in $\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}$: robustness of regularity for bounded sets of initial data in $\dot{H}^1$*, J.M.A.A. 400 (2013), no 1, 76–85.

[M1] Mucha, P., *Stability of 2D incompressible flows in R^3*, J. Differential Equations 245 (2008), no. 9, 2355–2367.

[M2] Mucha, P., *Stability of nontrivial solutions of the Navier-Stokes system on the three dimensional torus*, J. Differential Equations 172 (2001), no. 2, 359–375

[Pok] Pokorný, M., *Navier-Stokes system.* Prague, 2010, available online at http://ssdnm.mimuw.edu.pl/pliki/wyklady/pokorny.pdf, acc. 21.01.2016.

[Ser] Serrin, J., *The initial value problem for the Navier-Stokes system*, Nonlinear Problems (Proc. Sympos., Madison, Wis., 1962), 69 – 98, Univ. of Wisconsin Press, Madison, Wis., 1963.

[Tem] Temam, R., *Navier-Stokes Equations and Nonlinear Functional Analysis*, Second edition, SIAM, 1995.

[Za] Zajączkowski, W. M., *Some global regular solutions to NSE*, Math. Meth. Appl. Sc. 30 (2006), 123–151.

[ZaZa] Zajączkowski, W. M., Zadrzyńska, E., *Global regular solutions with large swirl to the NSE in a cylinder*, J. Math. Fluid Mech. 11 (2009), 126–169.

[Z] Zeidler, E., *Nonlinear Functional Analysis and its Applications II/A*, Springer, 1990.